

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected the claims as being obvious over Setagowa, Watkins, and U.S. Patent 6,415,101 issued to deCarmo that describes a method and system for scanning and displaying multiple view angles formatted in DVD content discussed previously.

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his timely response but maintains his position that none of the references taken singly or in any combination render the pending claims unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 for at least the following reasons.

With regard to the Examiner's response in the Final Office Action, the Applicant would like to state that at no time did the Applicant assert that "the prior art, Setogawa, Watkins and DeCarmo do not disclose the first and second segments correspond to the same point in time" as stated by the Examiner at page 2 line 4 of the Final Office Action. To the contrary, the Applicant responded to the Examiner's statement in the Office Action mailed 12/22/2005 that claim 22, "discloses that the first segment or the second segment corresponds to the same one point in time, so clearly, applicant's invention refers to the primary or secondary view that corresponds at that one point in time, i.e., multiple angles..." by stating that "at no point does claim 22 recite or even remotely suggest that the first and the second segments corresponds to the same point in time. On the contrary, claim 22 clearly teaches a method that permits a user to select a point in time from which to initiate playback of an audio/video program... the point in time from which to initiate displaying the A/V program is based upon the first point in time corresponding to the first segment or the second point in time corresponding to the second segment. The Applicant has amended claim 22 to more clearly describe this distinction." Furthermore, the Examiner clearly stated at page 2 line 17 of the Office Action mailed December 22, 2005 that "These multiple angles are obtained from that one point in time to obtain first and second segments, presentations or angles, and is taught in DeCarmo..." (emphasis added)

GENSP044

7

Therefore, the Examiner and the Applicants are in agreement that DeCarmo teaches that the various presentations are obtained from only a single point in time. The Applicant would also disagree with the Examiner's statement on page 3 line 1, that "the use of the display images derived from viewing the different points in time (i.e., chapters of a DVD)...is considered well known in the art of DVD technology." At no time has the Examiner provided prior art substantiating this belief since all the cited references teach only the same point in time. In particular, the Applicants know of no such DVD system that displays videos derived from chapters of a DVD,

"displaying on a display in normal playback mode a segment of a first presentation of said video portion;
displaying on said display in normal playback mode a segment of a second presentation of said video portion"

as required by the invention as recited in claim 11.

Therefore, by amending claim 22 to expressly recite that initiation of playback of the displayed presentations are based upon different points in time, the Applicant believes that the claim 22 is clearly not rendered obvious by any of the cited references taken singly or in any combination.


Claim 10 teaches that each of the presentations is independently actionable by a user and therefore there are no primary or secondary views as required by deCarmo. In particular, the Examiner cited column 2, lines 17 - 27 of deCarmo that clearly require a primary and remaining view angles that are subordinated to the primary view. In deCarmo, any modifications to the primary view similarly affect all of the subordinate views (lines 22 - 23 column 2). In contrast, the invention provides for direct selection of any of the displayed views without designating any as being a primary or a secondary view since all displayed presentations are independent of each other. In this way, the invention provides for direct selection of a desired presentation without, as required by deCarmo, redefining a desired view as the primary view, which only then responds to a user provided command (such as a selection event).

GENSP044

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300